

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Robert James Dixon, ) C/A No.: 1:11-2378-CMC-SVH  
                      )  
                      )  
Plaintiff,         )  
                      )  
                      )  
vs.                 )  
                      )  
                      ) ORDER  
Diane Wilks,       )  
                      )  
                      )  
Defendant.         )  
                      )  
                      )  
                      )


---

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment on May 16, 2012. [Entry #45]. As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order on May 16, 2012, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising him of the importance of a motion for summary judgment and of the need for him to file an adequate response. [Entry #46]. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, Defendant's motion may be granted, thereby ending this case.

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's *Roseboro* order, Plaintiff has failed to respond to the motion. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the motion and wishes to abandon this action. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to Defendant's motion for summary judgment by July 6, 2012. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, this action will be recommended for

dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.



June 22, 2012  
Columbia, South Carolina

Shiva V. Hodges  
United States Magistrate Judge